REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain in the application with claim 1 having been amended hereby.

With respect to the information disclosure statement, the information disclosure form (PTO-1449) listing the reference cited in the application is submitted herewith along with a copy of that Japanese patent application. Applicants, through their undersigned attorney, hereby certify that no English language translation is presently available to those individuals identified in 37 CFR § 1.56(c) for this non-English language references cited.

The Abstract of the disclosure has been amended herewith to address the examiner's concerns.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Ohta et al. (US 6,002,341).

The current invention pertains to an apparatus for controlling electronic equipment used in vehicles. Claim 1 recites a detection means for detecting a condition of use for the vehicle and a control means for placing the electronic equipment in a standby condition when the condition of use for the vehicle is detected.

According to this invention, the electronic equipment starts

out in a nonoperative state until a condition of use for the vehicle is detected at which point the electronic equipment moves from the nonoperative state to the standby state. This standby state allows the electronic equipment to be quickly activated when activation is desired.

Ohta describes an apparatus for keyless entry into a vehicle. According to Ohta, the door lock control unit is in an electricity-saving waiting mode (col. 4). This waiting mode is comparable to the standby condition described in the current invention. According to Ohta, when the remote control is activated, the door lock control unit unlocks the vehicle (col. 4).

There are key distinctions between the current invention and Ohta. Most notably among these key distinctions, the electrical equipment in Ohta (the door lock control unit) is in a constant standby state and is latter activated when the condition occurs. The electrical equipment according to the current invention begins in a nonoperative state and latter moves to a standby state when the condition occurs.

In claim 2, and in claims 4 and 6 which are dependant upon claim 2, a control unit is claimed. This control unit remains in a standby state and latter activates when the condition occurs. Although the control unit claimed is similar to the door lock

control unit in Ohta, claim 2 is dependant upon claim 1 and claim 1 is distinguishable from Ohta as stated above.

In claim 8, the use of a lock control signal is additionally claimed. Although a lock control signal is used in Ohta, claim 8 is dependant upon claim 1 and claim 1 is distinguishable from Ohta as stated above.

In claim 9, the handling of a door knob is claimed. The examiner believes that this handling of a door knob is comparable to the door handle switch disclosed in Ohta. It is respectfully submitted that this comparison is incorrect. The door handle switch disclosed in Ohta is a part of the door handle assembly "that is mounted behind the vehicle body." The function of this switch is to detect the "operational condition of the door handle" (col. 3 and Fig. 2). The door knob of claim 9 is not part of the door handle assembly, as in Ohta, but is that part of a car that is actuated to lock and unlock the door. This part is traditionally formed as a small cylinder and knob, hence its name. (see page 6 lines 10-13 "...manual handling to a door knob of the vehicle for unlocking a door lock mechanism...")

Additionally, claim 9 is dependant upon claim 1 and claim 1 is distinguishable from Ohta as stated above.

In claim 10, the Examiner believes that the control means claimed is comparable to the door lock control means in Ohta. The

Examiner also believes that the pose control means claimed is comparable to the door lock control means. Because the control means and the pose control means are two distinct means within the claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that the door lock control means from Ohta cannot be comparable to both the control means and the pose control means claimed.

The control means claimed is most comparable to the door lock control means in Ohta. The pose control means, however, is an element of the electronic equipment which causes the "electronic equipment to have a temporary nonoperative state in response to a manual handling to an actuating portion of the electronic equipment for vehicles" (page 9, lines 3-7). Ohta does not have a feature comparable to the pose control claimed.

Additionally, claim 10 is dependant upon claim 1 and claim 1 is distinguishable from Ohta as stated above.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the independent claim 1 hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that an Apparatus for Controlling an Electronic Equipment for Vehicles, as taught by the present disclosure and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown nor suggested in the cited reference.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 3, 5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being

unpatentable over Ohta et al. (US 6,002,341) as applied to claim 2 above, and in view of Hsu (US 6,339,340).

According to this invention as claimed in claim 3, the detecting means is capable of detecting starting voltage variations occurring in the control unit.

Hsu also discloses a method for bringing an electronic device out of standby by detecting voltage variations, however, Hsu relates to bringing a personal computer out of standby when the computer is turned on. The current invention does not relate to the activation of personal computers, and there is nothing in Hsu that suggests that this method could be applied to the activation of electronics associated with vehicles.

Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, the precise method by which the current invention detects a condition of use for the vehicle is only one element of the current invention. The examiner basis the rejection of claim 3 in large part on Ohta, and Ohta has been adequately distinguished from the current invention.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the independent claim 1 hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that an Apparatus for Controlling an Electronic Equipment for Vehicles, as taught by the present disclosure and as recited in the amended claims, is neither shown

nor suggested in the cited reference.

The references cited as of interest have been reviewed and are not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/JBG